

have been hired as computer programmers, stockbrokers, and supervisors.

One satisfied employer who used this high-technology service wrote back saying, "the guys coming out of the military are our best workers."

That comes as no surprise to anyone here, but it is good to know the word is getting out to employers nationwide.

All of this has led to a much friendlier transition for many thousands of military families.

The best indicator of our success is that thousands of employers who hire veterans come back to hire more through the automated systems and job fairs. A healthy economy is certainly helping, but the transition programs are ensuring that people leaving the military can match their skill to high quality civilian jobs.

The heart of my challenge 3 years ago was to help departing service members use their skill and leadership abilities to address some of our Nation's pressing needs. The problems I talked about then are, unfortunately, still with us today including violence in the streets and a need for discipline and role models in our schools.

In the fiscal year 1994 Defense Authorization Act, we created a program within the temporary early retirement authority which encouraged retiring service members to enter public and community service employment.

Under this program, if an early-retiree takes a job in a critically needed skill area, he or she can accrue additional military retirement credit up to the 20-year mark.

Today almost 9,000 individuals who chose early retirement are working in public and community service positions and, as such, are earning additional credits toward their military retirement. This program has encouraged many of our former service members to use their talents to improve their communities.

There has been a big push lately for the Federal Government to help States and localities cope with crime. But in many ways, the quality of law enforcement will never be better than the quality of the front line police officers patrolling the street. That's why I suggested that service people, with their training to think on their feet and handle complex and dangerous situations, be encouraged to pursue a law enforcement career.

To this end, we authorized the Troops to Cops Program. A combined effort of the Departments of Defense and Justice, Troops to Cops will provide funds to local law enforcement agencies to offset the initial cost of hiring former service members as police officers. We may never have statistics on the number of crimes prevented or how much safer people feel as a result of having these highly-trained professionals on their local police force, but America will certainly be the better for it.

Perhaps the most successful community service initiative we established

for people leaving the service is the troops to teachers program. This program provides stipends to assist people leaving the military in obtaining certification as elementary and secondary school teachers or teachers' aides.

In addition, it helps disadvantaged local schools that have a shortage of teachers and teachers' aides to hire program participants. This program helps bring together one of our greatest national needs, tough but inspiring teachers for tough schools, with one of our greatest national assets the men and women trained and molded by the Armed Forces.

Departing service members placed in the troops to teachers program everywhere from South Carolina to New York are writing back to the Department of Defense, raving about the support they've gotten.

To date, 4,337 departing service members have been selected for the troops to teachers program; 1,482 are now in training programs leading toward the necessary certification. And over 800 former soldiers, sailors, airmen and marines are already in classrooms helping America's kids. This is a success story of the first order.

In sum, Mr. President, the post-cold war drawdown of our forces and the transition programs for departing service members are a case of government doing a job well. The Congress, the executive branch, and the uniformed military each did their part, and we all had the readiness of the force and the well-being of the service members in mind as we created and executed these policies.●

NAZI WAR CRIMES DISCLOSURE

● Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, I rise today to lend my strong support to H.R. 1281. This sense of the Congress measure is intended to act as a first step to urge several Federal agencies through the Freedom of Information Act, to open their files that contain information about individuals that are believed to have participated in Nazi war crimes.

This sense of the Congress measure stems from the efforts of Representative MALONEY of my home State of New York. Representative MALONEY propose H.R. 1281, a bill that would have amended the National Security Act of 1947, and required Federal agencies to make public under the Freedom of Information Act, all information regarding individuals who participated in Nazi War Crimes during World War II.

Mr. President, it is very important that we make a strong statement in this body that all the facts relating to the Holocaust be brought to light. I believe that it is our duty to never forget the millions of people who died in the Holocaust. Further, I believe we also have a duty to the survivors and victim's families to pursue every answer into this terrible period in the history of man. Yet, over 50 years have passed since the end of World War II and we

still have many unanswered questions. Some of these questions can be answered with the cooperation of our own Federal agencies, but, some agencies have inexplicably blocked access to files and information that could help to shed light on the Holocaust and Nazi war criminals. These answers could help to provide piece of mind to millions of people around our country and around the world. Further, the release of these Nazi war crime files could provide historians with a more clear view of these horrible events over half a century ago, thus helping to ensure the despicable acts of the Holocaust are never repeated.

The survivors and victim's families have waited too long. The time to open the files is now, there can be no more excuses. I urge my colleagues to join me in this effort and ask for their support on this measure.●

TRIBUTE TO THE 1996 OLYMPICS GAMES

● Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, this year marked the 100th anniversary of the Olympic games. As with any Olympiad, hard work, blood, sweat, and tears culminated in 2 weeks' worth of contested international sportsmanship. The best of America, and the world, competed for the thrill of victory again on American soil in Atlanta, GA. There, over 10,000 athletes from 197 countries were brought together—with the world watching—to witness 17 days worth of comradery, expectation, determination, triumph, and defeat.

I am proud that West Virginia played a key role in allowing the 1996 Olympic summer games to proceed. Two historical cities of my State, Wheeling and Martinsburg, hosted separate Olympic time-trial qualifying events for cycling. This was a first. West Virginia had never hosted an Olympic trials event. But our role contributed to the selection of the most superior men and women cyclists ever to represent the United States. For cycling enthusiasts, the eyes of the Nation were focused on these world-class riders. But they also witnessed the best attributes of my State—the beautiful outdoors, friendly people, culture, communities, and spirit that defines the proud residents of Appalachia.

The 1996 Olympic games, America's Games, began on July 19 when the Olympic torch entered Olympic Stadium. The torch carried a flame that had traveled from Athens, Greece, on an 84-day voyage to the United States host city. The flame represented both an ending and a beginning.

It symbolized an ending to the first 100 years of the modern Olympic games. Since 1896, we have seen our world savaged by wars, famines, Depression, and conflict. At times, it seemed unlikely that not much more than the spirit of the games would survive. But it did. Each and every time, the flame was relit—its message of hope and strength brought the world

together through the efforts, the joys, and the sorrows of individual athletes.

We shall celebrate the almost miraculous accomplishments of American sprinter Jesse Owens, setting record after record in Nazi Germany while the crowds cheered him to victory. And the tenacity of the Philadelphia butcher's apprentice, Smokin' Joe Frazier, who struck heavyweight gold in Tokyo even though he had a broken right hand. How about American Bob Beamon's incredible 29-foot 2½-inch. performance in the long jump in Mexico City, the longest Olympic record to ever stand. Swimmer Mark Spitz, who owned the press of the first half of the Munich games by dominating seven events. A personal memory I will always have concerns the perfect gymnastic performances of Mary Lou Retton, a Fairmont, WV, native, who in Los Angeles won the women's all-around. I will also never forget one of the most touching images of will and determination ever to occur at the games. This was showcased in Barcelona when Derrick Readman of Great Britain fell in the 400 meter competition after severely pulling a hamstring and finished the race leaning on his father. These are all old, but cherished memories.

The torch also symbolized a beginning, the beginning of the next centennial in Olympic history. The challenge is set in the new centennial to rekindle the two basic values that are at the core of the Olympic movement. One is the competitive fire that spurs individuals to pursue excellence in their sport and demand the best of themselves. The other is the cooperative spirit that tempers individual competition through teamwork, harmony, and understanding.

I think the 1996 Atlanta games has led us into the next centennial quite well. As host, the city translated its confidence in itself into respected internationalism. It helped guide us all once again across every barrier of race, creed, language, and culture to seek a common ground of understanding sportsmanship. This was not without cost, but the city and Olympic officials responded to the needs of athletes, coaches, spectators, tourists, and residents with swift action. They also continued to profile veteran competitors and fresh faces who embody the Olympic motto of Citius, Altius, Fortius—swifter, higher, stronger—and the epitome of excellence. People such as Michael Johnson, Kerri Shrug, members of the dream team, Dan O'Brien, Janet Evans, Tom Dolan, Jackie Joyner-Kersey, West Virginian Randy Barnes, Carl Lewis, Mia Hamm, and Gwen Torrence immediately spring to mind. They proudly represented the strong heritage and the competitive nature encompassed in the Olympic spirit, and I commend them and every other Olympian who has ever dared to follow a dream to be the best.●

DEFENSE OF MARRIAGE ACT AND THE EMPLOYMENT NON-DISCRIMINATION ACT

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, I rise to discuss the Defense of Marriage Act and the Employment Non-Discrimination Act, voted on a few weeks ago. The former passed overwhelmingly in both the House and the Senate and the latter was rejected in the Senate and not voted on in the House. I voted for the Defense of Marriage Act and against the Employment Non-Discrimination Act. I would like to explain why I did so, and why I believe passage of DOMA and the failure of ENDA were proper.

In enacting Federal legislation, I believe our first consideration should always be whether a Federal solution both legitimate and necessary. Legitimate; that is, under our Constitution's allocation of powers between the national government and the States. Necessary in the sense that the States cannot solve a particular problem on their own.

Using these criteria, the Defense of Marriage Act is a limited, legitimate, and needed Federal intervention to protect the States' ability to set their own policies regarding single-sex marriage. By contrast, the Employment Non-Discrimination Act would have imposed a one-size-fits-all solution governing employment discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation without any clear and convincing showing that there is a national problem in this area. In addition, ENDA would have adopted measures far too sweeping even on the hypothesis that some national legislation was needed.

Consider first the Defense of Marriage Act, which dealt with whether the States' have an obligation under Federal law to recognize single-sex marriages. Not, it is important to understand, whether States may recognize such marriages under their own laws. DOMA leaves the States entirely free to do so or not as they may please. In fact, it leaves the States entirely free, through their legislatures or their courts, to define marriage in any way they choose.

DOMA deals only with the following issue: If State A decides to allow people of the same sex to marry, does Federal law require State B to treat these individuals as married as well if they decide to move to State B? DOMA answers that question in the negative: No, Federal law does not require State B to treat them as married just because State A chooses to do so.

This is not merely a hypothetical question. In fact, the Supreme Court of Hawaii has already strongly hinted that in its view the Hawaii Constitution requires recognition of same-sex marriages, with a final ruling to that effect from a lower Hawaii court expected any day now.

The extraterritorial effect such a ruling must receive is a quintessentially Federal matter. Indeed, even if Congress had done nothing, whether the

other 49 States would have to treat individuals of the same sex married in Hawaii as married outside of Hawaii would still have been decided by Federal law. Although no State has yet recognized same sex marriages, all 50 States generally recognize marriages performed in another State, largely on account of Federal conflict of law rules and the Federal Full Faith and Credit Clause. Without any congressional legislation, whether the States would also be required to recognize same-sex marriages contracted out-of-state would likewise have turned on these Federal laws, and therefore, only Federal legislation can assure the States will be permitted to decide this issue for themselves.

Additionally, some States, including my own home State of Michigan, have recently enacted laws explicitly refusing to recognize same-sex marriages contracted in other States. Whether these laws would be allowed to stand likewise would have been a Federal issue even in the absence of any action by Congress. The courts, including, ultimately, the U.S. Supreme Court, would have either enforced these exceptions as being consistent with the Federal Constitution's Full Faith and Credit Clause or would have struck them down pursuant to that Clause.

Thus it is very hard to see how congressional action to make clear that other States need not recognize a same-sex marriage simply because it was recognized in Hawaii can possibly be cast as an illegitimate intervention by the national government. The national government necessarily has to choose sides, either to say that the Hawaii view shall prevail in all 50 States, or that it need not do so, or that it shall do so in some instances. How it chooses sides is the only open question. The Federal government will either resolve this issue by means of a statute adopted by a Congress elected by the people of the States and signed into law by the popularly elected President or by means of a U.S. Supreme Court decision applying existing Federal conflict-of-law principles and the Federal Constitution's Full Faith and Credit clause as best it can. But in any event, the Federal Government will be resolving what effect these marriages will have outside of Hawaii.

That being the case, it is clear to me that there is no reason to prefer that this decision be made by the Federal courts than by the democratically elected components of the Federal Government. Rather, it is better for this choice to be made by the democratically elected branches—that is, by Congress and the President.

Having established that the decision at issue—the extraterritorial effects of Hawaii's laws—is inevitably one that must be made by the national Government, and one that should be made by that Government's elected rather than life-tenured officials, the question that remains to be decided is the bottom line: should other States be required by